

those long Saturdays competing at swim meets all over North Houston. Kara not only took to sports but academics in high school. She lettered 4 years in basketball, was the team captain, high scorer her senior year and played in the Texas State playoffs. Volleyball and cheerleading were also activities she enjoyed and participated in.

After doing some babysitting jobs at 15, Kara applied to work at a local Target store while in school. On her job application, she was asked about her job experiences and reason for leaving her previous job. So she put, quote, "last job, baby sitting." Reason for leaving, quote, "Kids were brats." Blunt truth got her the job.

She continued to tell it like it was, even to this day. At Target, Kara Poe learned how to deal with real people in the real world by working as a cashier. She doesn't like to admit it, but she even held the long-time record as the fastest scanner. She has continued her studies and studied endlessly. She played high school sports, and has continued to work and save as much money as she possibly can.

By the way, Mr. Speaker, Kara graduated valedictorian from her high school, Northland Christian High School in Houston, Texas. Kara, like all the Poe kids, went to Abilene Christian University, and she worked while in college and still was able to graduate with a grade point average of 3.88 with a B.S. in interdisciplinary studies, English and history.

Quite opinionated on all subjects, especially politics and sports, being an avid Astros fan, she loves the freedoms and loves this country.

She went on to get her Master's degree at Abilene Christian University in English, and her GPA was a perfect 4.0. She got married to a guy by the name of Shane Alexander; I was honored to perform that wedding. She has a 10-month-old daughter named Elizabeth.

Mr. Speaker, this Saturday that little girl who had trouble with speech in third grade will receive her doctoral degree from the University of Louisville in rhetoric and composition. She has a GPA of 3.92.

At 29, she obtained her doctoral degree in less than 4 years, a marvelous amount of time and a short time for obtaining a doctorate.

She already has a job at Baylor University in Waco, Texas, and she will be teaching on the tenured track. She will be teaching English, Mr. Speaker, and she will be a teacher like her mother, both her grandmothers and her sister, Kim.

So, Kara, as your dad, I am proud of your determination, commitment and attitude. Congratulations to you for your success in the field and noble field of education and being a teacher. Congratulations to you for your success in life.

That's just the way it is.

□ 2000

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

LOSING GROUND ON THE WAR ON TERRORISM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, the so-called war on terrorism has been going on for more than 4½ years, and it looks like terrorism is winning.

The U.S. Government released its annual survey of global terrorism two Fridays ago. Of course, they always save the bad news for Friday, when they hope everyone will have checked out for the weekend. The results? The number of terrorists attacks worldwide quadrupled from 2004 to 2005, climbing over 11,000. That is 30 strikes by terrorists every day, an average of more than one an hour.

Of the 11,000, nearly one-third took place in Iraq, and those Iraqi attacks led to 8,300 deaths. Keep in mind, these are just civilian casualties. These numbers don't even include the number of American troops who have been killed at the hands of the insurgency.

Thank goodness there have been no more attacks on American soil and nothing on the order of 9/11. Then again, if violent extremists want to kill Americans, they don't have to infiltrate our borders. They can make a much easier trip to Iraq, where 130,000 of our bravest men and women are deployed.

The dirty little secret that you won't find in the report is that the Iraq war is responsible for the proliferation of terrorism in recent years. Our preemptive invasion strike on Iraq inspired vicious animosity towards the United States, the likes of which we have never seen and the likes of which we will be dealing with for years and years to come.

The continued occupation is a rallying point for bin Laden and everyone who already dislikes America. The war has given jihadists the best possible propaganda tool, turning Iraq into a hotbed of terrorism. And the way we have conducted the war has only exacerbated the problem. The abuses at Abu Ghraib, the detention camps at Guantanamo, the secret gulags around the world, all of these have eroded U.S. moral authority and further radicalized the Muslim world.

The President has sold the Iraq campaign as some kind of antidote to terrorism. The truth is just the opposite. Our presence in Iraq is pouring gasoline on the fire instead of putting it out.

Peter Bergen, a terrorism expert at the New America Foundation, put it

this way: he said, "The President is right that Iraq is the main front in the war on terrorism, but this is a front we created."

There was one part of the terrorism report that I just could not believe. The Washington Post cites the survey as indicating that bin Laden and al-Zawahiri are frustrated by their lack of direct control over terrorist operations. Here is a man who is American public enemy number one, a sadistic killer who President Bush promised to hunt down and capture, dead or alive, and the best we can say 4½ years later is that we have got him frustrated?

There is only one answer, Mr. Speaker: we must bring our troops home, and we must do it at once. Every day that we persist with this occupation is another day that the insurgency gathers strength and further justifies itself. Every day that we stay in Iraq is a day that we lose ground in the war on terror.

It is time for a new counterterrorism strategy like the one I have outlined in my SMART Security proposal; one that is based on strong intelligence and cooperation with our allies and multilateral organizations; one that invests in homeland security and enhances efforts to cut off financing for terrorist organizations.

Defeating terrorism will require more brains and less brawn. It demands, first and foremost, that we bring our troops home.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BASS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BASS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

MAINTAINING AIR SUPERIORITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, in 1781, George Washington, even though he had won the Revolutionary War, kept the Army intact and on alert for 2 more years until the signing of the peace treaty, saying, "There is nothing that will so soon produce a speedy and honorable peace as a state of preparedness for war."

Now, this week we will be voting on the Defense Authorization Act, which is not talking about our military in this year or the next year, but 10 and 15 years from now, because those who have our positions 10 and 15 years from now will have their military and their diplomatic options defined by what we do on the Defense Authorization Act this week.

The United States is superpower because of the quality of the individuals we have in our military and the technology and weapons system that back them up. As former general and Secretary of State Colin Powell said, "If

we go to war, we don't want to be in a fair fight."

Now, Operation Desert Storm in the early 1990s illustrated the awesome air superiority we have. Afghanistan and Iraq clearly illustrate our air superiority. In fact, the United States has had air superiority since the Korean War. However, we have flown a military sortie every day for the past 15 years, and it is starting to take its toll on our equipment.

A Defense Department study recently said that there has been a 10 percent decline in the mission capable rates of our aircraft since Desert Storm in the 1990s. Now, this 10 percent reduction is not because we have maintenance deficiencies or trained personnel deficiencies. It is because we are still flying the same aircraft, this time, though, much older and with hundreds of more flight hours on the same airframe.

In the 1990s, we took a procurement holiday in Congress and wanted to cash in on the so-called "peace dividend," which simply meant in practical terms the defense budget was cut in favor of other Federal spending and the new generation of fighters, the F-22s, the F-35s, were caught in the cross-hairs of that spending practice and shoved to the outside years, which meant we are now starting to fall behind. We were ignoring the leapfrog of technology that is available to our systems. We are now realizing that the F-22 and the F-35 are going to be that which closes gaps and helps us to ensure air dominance for the foreseeable future.

Both the 22 and the 35 employ stealth technology, which provides our warfighters with a critical edge in any conflict, even in low intensity battles like Iraq. Those responsible for planning the air campaign need the protections provided by stealth fighters in protecting other non-stealth aircraft, as well as ground combat.

The flight range of the 22 is three times the combat radius, and the 35 is projected to have more than double the unrefueled combat radius of the fighters they would hope to replace. The avionics would allow them for a longer stand-off, which simply means we, the good guys, can see, detect, and shoot down the bad guys before they recognize we are in the area, which is what we want to have in any type of combat.

These weapons systems we are talking about are incorporating high-tech advances in composite technologies which result in more durable aircraft parts, reduced corrosion, and lessen the needs of maintenance in the future. What we are doing, Mr. Speaker, is planning for the future.

In 2004, we had a program called Cope India, which revealed that pilots outside the United States are certainly capable of achieving very high levels of proficiency. While we don't count India as a likely enemy, this exercise was an eye-opener for the United States in the sense that it demonstrated the United States can no longer take for granted

that it will always be facing an inferior air adversary, even amongst Third World nations.

Fifteen years from now we do not know whether we will be fighting a war of terror or a conventional war. But, as Washington said, we must be prepared for whatever circumstances may be there. Because at the end of the day when we are compelled to take up arms to defend our freedom, we don't want to be in a fair fight. We want our sons and daughters to have the very best capabilities, and we want to prevail.

We must recommit as a Nation to provide the support and the resources to properly field the next generation of fighters, the F-22 and the F-35. We have an oversight responsibility to make sure that these programs are carried out in a responsible manner. We need to work together to ensure that they succeed, because they are one of the most important foundation blocks of our future national defense.

Terrorism does not take a holiday. We cannot. We must look forward to the future, so that 10 and 15 years down the line we will be able to defend ourselves in an appropriate way.

A NEED FOR SELF-MADE LEADERS, NOT DERIVATIVE LEADERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I have been asking myself why the President of the United States really can't get a grip on policies that would help America become energy independent here at home. Last week, as we were looking at rising gasoline prices all across our country, he suggested that we import, import more ethanol.

I thought about that comment and his whole administration's lack of attention to energy independence for our country, and I sort of sat there at my desk and thought, why would the President behave this way? And I thought a lot about how we form our personalities and when we take whatever occupation we get into as adults, why we behave the way we do.

There are some personalities that result from experiences that make you self-made, and then there are those personalities that I call derivative personalities, and their behaviors result from a different set of experiences, so when they get in a job they really can't command and direct, because they have never really done it themselves.

Here is an example. I grew up in a family where our mother made our clothing. We didn't have a lot of money, so we learned how to scrimp, and we learned how to invent and to create. And those are learned skills.

The President grew up in a family that was extraordinarily wealthy. I would guess that they bought most of their clothes. In fact, I can remember when the President, his father, didn't even know how much socks cost in the

store during one of his Presidential races. They always bought everything. They never made. They had enough assets, he inherited enough, that they really didn't have to learn how to be self-made. So he doesn't have a mind that lends itself to creativity necessarily.

We came from a family where we ran our own small business. Our dad made his own products. We made our own sausages, our own meatloafs, our own pickles. Dad had to do everything himself. He had to figure out how to finance his business.

We have a President who inherited his wealth. Everything that he did, he had this soft landing pad. He failed a number of times in businesses that he inherited from his own family, but he never really paid the consequences, because someone was always there to catch him and to refinance him, even in the purchase of the baseball team that he owned, which then he eventually sold and used those dollars to get elected President of the United States. Most American families don't have that kind of landing pad.

In our family, we had to earn our way to go to college, and we had to get good grades, because there was nobody there that was going to save you. Nobody in our family had ever gone to college before. I had to keep good grades to keep a scholarship up for the scholarship I did receive.

But the President's education was paid for by his family. In fact, he was admitted to schools, based on his grades, that most Americans could never get admitted to.

I think what these kinds of experiences do is create a different kind of personality, a personality of people who are self-made and they know how to create, versus a personality that is more derivative and sometimes can't solve problems, and they look to someone else to solve them.

So if we have an energy problem in America, the President would look to somebody else. And he says, well, let's import the ethanol. He doesn't really think about creating a whole new industry here at home and using the Government of the United States to help create that industry.

That is why he has proposed cutting programs. At the same time out of one side of his mouth he talks about energy addiction, but then is trying to use the Government of the United States to create a new energy future for America. He really doesn't know what to do with it when he is in command of it.

It was actually Congress that adopted the first energy title to a farm bill. It didn't come from the administration. And if you look at every single budget that he has offered, he talks about energy independence, and then he cuts the programs that would lead us in that direction.

What America really needs is a new biofuels industry as a complement to other forms of power that we can create. But we need self-made people to